## The displaced residents

11-10-4

One rarely hears the Examiner fulminate so fiercely as in its Oct. 31 editorial "Big Brother bill at the City Hall." The measure currently before the Supervisors to require developers to find relocation housing for those they displace is characterized as "meddlesome," "mischief," "public paternalism at its worst," a product of "fuzzy ideology," and so on.

The fact is that each year several hundred low income San Franciscans are displaced from their homes by developers who want to turn the land to more profitable uses. In The City's tight housing market, decent relocation housing is difficult to find, and in most cases will cost the tenant more, since this demolition activity serves to inflate rents by intensifying the housing shortage.

It is by no means unreasonable that government should act to protect these people from wanton damage by developers, just as The City now requires developers to meet other conditions in the public interest (to build within zoning restrictions, etc.).

The Examiner's editorial says the city "has no business imposing on property owners the doubtful social burden of doing for tenants what they are perfectly capable of doing, and should do, for themselves." The City has every right and obligation to protect its less wealthy and less powerful citizens against profitseeking developers . . .

This is a responsibility the supervisors' planning, housing and development committee has already acknowledged in passing the ordinance out favorably. It is a need recognized by the more than 30 neighborhood organizations all over The City, from Pacific Heights to the Mission, that have endorsed the bill. And it hopefully will become city law when the full Board of Supervisors acts on the measure in the next few weeks.

CHESTER W. HARTMAN San Francisco **City Hall shorts** 

This ordinance is going to stifle progress and discourage investment in San Francisco. We almost lost Embarcadero Center over the objections of knee-jerk liberals like these." With such arguments, Sup. Terry Francois led the Jan. 11 floor fight that killed a demolition ordinance that residents of the International Hotel and other low-income housing advocates labored on for ten months. The ordinance would have guaranteed minimal relocation benefits to the several hundred poor, elderly and Third World renters thrown out on the street every year by private landlords tearing down housing in SF. But "liberals" like Francois, Ron Pelosi and Dianne Feinstein voted against the bill and it lost, 7-4 . . . Supporters of the bill were more than a-little miffed at Feinstein. Attorney Nelson Dong, who drafted the ordinance, told me Feinstein assured him when she was running for mayor she would vote for the bill "on the eve of the election." Feinstein says she never committed herself to the ordinance: "I made the commitment I would support it. if I could," she said. "Why am I always the one singled out for blame?"... Next big housing battle: Tenants and Owners Opposed to Redevelopment (TOOR), will come before the supervisors in the next few weeks with a request that the city release several hundred thousand dollars in hotel tax money earmarked for 400 units of low-income housing as part of a Yerba

Buena Center settlement agreement between TOOR and the Redevelopment Agency . . . Meanwhile, Mayor Moscone said at a Jan. 8 press conference that "the present YBC plan is abandoned." Presumably, this includes Melvin Swig's plans for a "nonprofit" corporation to build and operate a YBC sports arena, Moscone will have a chance to veto the plan when Swig returns to the supervisors for approval of his bond proposal, management contract and operating lease. The board mustered only seven votes in giving Swig preliminary approval of the arena on Dec. 15, one vote short of the number needed to override a Moscone veto of the plan... Next commission Moscone plans to appoint is the Planning Commission and the appointment of a new planning director should follow soon after. Current speculation centers on George Williams of the planning staff, who's worked on the RAP program, on-Al Baum, former planning commissioner and BCDC deputy, and on former supervisor Jack Morrison, who's heading Moscone's search committee for new commissioners. But Moscone aide Corey Busch told me Moscone "hasn't interviewed anyone" for the job yet, and said the mayor "may conduct a nation-wide search" for a new director .

-Jerry Roberts

Relocation mischief

To the Editor: 1-1/76
Under the terms of the tenant

relocation ordinance, low income tenants are those who earn less thatn \$12,500 per year. The Supervisors fit into that category since that is approximately their

pay scale.

Had the relocation ordinance passed, it would appear that it might be extended to include the supervisors and grant them lifetime tenancy in their jobs and any attempt to remove them would result in finding them a similar nesting place with no more than a 10 per cent decrease

in pay.

Their new positions, of course, would have to be located in a similar neighborhood with the same cultural, social and linguistic background from which the supervisors would be displaced. Now we all know that city hall is a permanently attached improvement in a specific area and to relocate the dispossed supervisors would be a truly difficult job since there is no comparable roosting place for turkeys - at large.

It is appalling that Mrs. von Beroldingen, a practicing attorney, does not appear to have the slightest knowledge of real property law. A month - to - month tenancy is just what the name implies. A lease in an interest in real property for a specific period is less than a freehold.

The proposed tenant relocation bill would guarantee tenants a lifetime interest in the property under its terms and is so obviously unconstitutional in violation of property rights that one wonders what is going on when an ordinance is written and introduced.

Where are the competent advisors to the board, and how does

such mischief get introduced? If the supervisors are endorsing a return to feudalism. let them say so otherwise they ought to do their homework before introducing foolish bills and wasting the taxpayer's money.

Andrew J. Betancourt

# Replacement housing To the Editor: (1-5-15

The Board of Supervisors now has before it a proposed ordinance which begins to remedy a serious injustice which thousands of San Franciscans experience each year.

Under existing state and federal laws, families and individuals displaced by public action (urban renewal, highways, etc.) are guaranteed decent replacement housing, plus financial compensation against moving expenses and higher rents. But those displaced by private developers get nothing other than an eviction notice.

The proposed ordinance requires that developers seeking permission to demolish a structure with three or more units provide the residents with comparable replacement housing as a precondition to receipt of a city demolition permit.

The legislation places some of the costs of this kind of displacement where they belong - on the profit-seeking developer, rather than on the displacee, who usually is poor, nonwhite or elderly. If some big corporation wants to tear down the International Hotel to put up an office building, or the Joyce Hotel for a Shell Station, the very least public policy should require is that these developers be responsible for locating decent alternative quarters at rents the displacees can afford. No replacement housing, no city demolition permit.

It's a simple issue, and the Supervisors will have to take sides: Which right is more important — the right to make a profit on real estate development or the right of people to be insured of a decent place to live?

Chester W. Hartman

## Tenant relocation

## ordinance killed

An ordinance which would have given low income tenants relocation rights if their homes were demolished was defeated Monday by the Board of Supervisors.

The vote was 4 to 7 with Supervisors Robert Gonzales, Bob Mendelshon, John Molinari and Dorothy von Beroldingen voting in favor of the legislation.

The controversial legislation had been opposed by real estate and business groups and supported by several community and tenant groups.

It would have required landlords to find replacement housing for low income tenants (earning \$12,500 or less for a family of four), displaced because the landlords decided to demolish his rental property.

Among the provisions which elicited the most opposition were requirements that the relocation housing:

• Cost no more than 10 per cent over what the tenant had been paying during the past year;

· Be similar to the unit being

demolished:

Meet code standards;

• Be located in the same or

similar neighborhood.

With regard to this last item, the neighborhool would have had to be of the same economic, social, cultural and linguistic background as the neighborhood from which the person was displaced.

To comply with objections that these requirements would be impossible to meet, the ordinance was amended to state that the standards must be met "to the greatest extent feasible."

Expressing his opposition to the legislation, Supervisor Terry Francois charged it is the creation of "knee - jerk liberals."

This ordinance would lead to the deterioration of housing in San Francisco by impeding the demolition of substandard dwelling, said Francois. As the City deteriorated, the first people who would flee to the suburbs would be these same knee jerk liberals, he charged.

(Continued on Page 16)

#### Tenant relocation

(Continued from Page 1;

Noting that the ordinance does not apply when a landlord has been ordered through condemnation procedures to demolish his building, Francois said the legislation would encourage landlords to let their properties deteriorate until they are ordered to tear them down.

Francois also said the ordinance would destroy "The whole concept of highest and best use." Highest and best use is essential to the City's tax base, he said.

Finally Francois questioned the cost of enforcing the ordinance. Since both the Human Rights Commission and the Department of Public Works (DPW) would play enforcement roles, this legislation could prove to be costly, he said.

Carrying the ball for the prop-

onents, Mrs. von Beroldingen said that as long as the City issues permits for demolitions, it should take responsibility for the welfare of low income tenants displaced by these demolitions.

The relocation requirements were intended to deal with the fact that for many tenants, relocation is a traumatic experience. This is particularly true for long term tenants, she said.

"I feel this is legislation that is socially and economically desirable if we are to preserve the quality of life in San Francisco," said Mrs. von Beroldingen.

Mrs. von Beroldingen agreed that the ordinance would make it more difficult to demolish structures. That has its good side, she said, however. It would encourage people to rehabilitate housing.

# Supervisors eye tenant legislation

Landlords who want to demolish their buildings may soon have to find replacement housing for their tenants.

The Board of Supervisors is scheduled to vote this Monday on an ordinance which would place this obligation on persons who own buildings with three or more rental units.

The law would protect tenants, particularly senior citizens and low income persons, from being thrown on the streets with little concern for their well being, according to Supervisor John Molinari, sponsor of the legislation.

The ordinance has already received the unanimous backing of the Supervisors' Planning, Housing

and Development Committee.

The Committee came to that conclusion after listening to lengthy testimony from representatives of such groups as the International Hotel Tenants Association, Western Addition Project Area Committee (WAPAC), Committee Against Nehonmachi Eviction (CANE), Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC), San Francisco Ecology Center and the Goodman Building Group.

The legislation was spurred by concern for the fate of the low income tenants who have been fighting the demolition of the International Hotel (848

Kearney St.).

#### Landlords face fees

(Continued from Page 2)

All testimony was in favor of the ordinance. City Planning officials expressed concern, however, that the legislation might be too stringent.

The law would require the landlord to find similar housing at a similar rent in the same or a nearby similar neighborhood.

On top of this the replacement housing would

have to be up to code.

To meet concerns that these conditions might prove impossible to meet, the legislation was changed to say that the requirements must be met "to the greatest extent possible."

# Tenant relocation debate

By Carol Kroot

Elections are over, the holidays are drawing to an end and it looks like the Board of Supervisors may at long last get back to business.

A number of controversial items have been scheduled for the board's calendar next Monday.

One of these is an ordinance requiring landlords to relocate their tenants should the landlords decide to demolish their rental units. The ordinance would apply where three units or

more are involved.

The board refused to touch the controversial item several weeks ago when it appeared on the board's agenda on the eve of the November election. Instead the Supervisors unanimously sent the ordinance back to committee for a third hearing.

That hearing took place earlier this month and the arguments remained the same.

Proponents say the legislation would protect the welfare of tenants when rental property is demolished.

Among those who support the legislation are representatives of the International Hotel Tenants Association, Western Addition Project Area Committee (WAPAC). Committee Against Nehonmachi Eviction (CANE). Haight - Ashbury Neighborhood Council (HANC), San Francisco Ecology Center and the Goodman Building

The ordinance is also supported by the City Planning Department. At a hearing in October.

Planning Director Dean Macris said the ordinance would affect few landlords and that the cost of relocating the tenants would not be beyond the means of these property owners.

Opposition to the ordinance has come from the San Francisco Board of Realtors, the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, the City's Redevelopment Agency and the Bureau of Building Inspections (BBI).

Opponents argue that the legislation would work as a disincentive to

investment in San Francisco. Landlords would he hesitant to replace dilapidated buildings and neighborhoods would run down, they say.

On top of this the ordinance would be difficult and costly for the City to enforce and for landlords to meet, say opponents. The cost of complying with such a City enacted social policy should be born by the public sector and not by private landowners they argue.

The ordinance goes before the full Board of Supervisors Monday. with two of the three Planning, Housing and Development Committee members supporting it. They are Supervisors Dorothy von Beroldingen and Bob Mendel-

The third committee member, Supervisor Ronald Pelosi, opposes the legislation. Local government and not the private property owner should have to assume the cost of relocating these tenants, said

Pelosi.

sohn.

If passed Monday, the ordinance would require landlords to find for their about-to-be-dislocated tenants similar housing at similar rents in the same or a nearby similar neighborhood. The replacement housing would have to meet code and the other requirements, "to the greatest extent possible".

# Tenant relocation debate due Monday

A controversial ordinance regarding tenant relocation is on the Board of Supervisor's agenda next Monday.

the board referred back to committee last month, would require landlords to relocate their tenants if the landtheir buildings.

The supervisors' Development Committee last week endorsed the legislation for the second time.

It made certain changes before doing so. however. Among those is a provision giving relocation rights to only low and moderate income tenants. Another amendment would clearly exempt the Redevelopment Agency and other governmental bodies from the ordinance.

The legislation had been re-referred to committee last month when a number of public agencies indicated that they had been unpre-

pared to discuss the ordinance at the September hearing.

Those agencies - Redevelopment, the The ordinance, which Bureau of Building Inspections (BBI) and the Real Estate Board — all opposed the ordinance at last week's hearing.

"It is our very strong lords want to demolish feeling that legislation of this kind is a disincentive to investment in our Planning, Housing and City," said Arthur Evans, head of the Redevelopment Agency.

The requirements are exceptionally difficult to meet and will invite litigation, said Evans.

Edward Lawson of the Breater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce told the committee that the ordinance would put the cost of implementing a social policy on property owners. If such a law is to be passed, the expense of relocation should be born by the City, said Lawson.

The only department head to speak in favor of the legislation was Dean Macris of City Planning.

Public officials should not lose sight of the bad side effects of demolitions, said Macris.

The ordinance would affect very few landand the cost of relocating the tenants would not be beyond the means of these property owners. Macris said.

Nelson Dong, an attorney who helped write the legislation, presented the supervisors with a list of buildings demolished in 1974. "A casual glance indicates that these are not mama and papa landowners." said Dong. Some deal in multi-million dollar properties, he said.

The ordinance, sponsored by Supervisor John Molinari, was first developed when concern was raised over the plight of the tenants at the International Hotel (848 Kearny). Residents of that building for several years have been fighting the structure.

The ordinance if passed would require landlords who want to demolish their buildings to find for their tenants safe, sanitary relocation housing situated in the same or in a similar. nearby neighborhood.

The ordinance would also provide that the relocation units be situated in much the same way they were in the demolished building and that the relocation housing not cost more than 10 per cent above what the tenants' paid in the demolished building.

To meet concerns that these provisions would be impossible to satisfy. an amendment has been added to the ordinance stating that the stipulations should be met "to the greatest extent feasible."

# Relocation law delay by board

It was sidestepping time at the Board of Supervisors Monday, the eve of the local election.

The supervisors, intent on getting to that last night of campaigning and not offending anyone just before the election, failed to act on most controversial items on their agenda.

One of those items — an ordinance giving low - income tenants relocations rights if their homes are demolished by their landlords — was sent back to committee for the second time in a month.

The unanimous vote occurred without debate. The last time the measure had been sent back to committee, the vote was 6 to 5.

The proposed ordinance would require owners of three rental units or more to relocate qualified tenants should the owners decide to demolish their buildings.

The landlord would "to the greatest extent possible" have to find for his tenants similar housing at similar rents in the same or a nearby similar neighborhood. The replacement housing would have to meet code requirements.

#### Demolishing slums

To the Editor:

The proposed law which would require landlords who want to demolish rental structures of more than three units to relocate their tenants "in similar" ac-commodations "in a similar neighborhood" at similar rents is

contrary to existing laws.

Housing and civil laws specifically state that all units must be maintained in a "good and clean condition, free from structural damage; with operable electrical wiring, adequate heating, proper ventilation, hot and cold running water, and appropriate plumbing fixtures; free from vermin (cockroaches), free from rats and mice . . . . . . Therefore;

similar relocation is illegal?
The Gartland Apartments fire; 3,000 plus other buildings in San Francisco which have been cited for substantial violations of housing and civil codes are the direct responsibility of one Alfred Goldberg. Tenants in San Francisco should picket for the eviction of Mr. Goldberg and use every legal method to replace Director Goldberg with a responsible Bureau of Building Inspectors official.

Mr. Goldberg does not want to "fine" slumlords the required \$500 penalty for violations...this would mean more than \$1,500,000 which ought to be delivered to the General Fund of the City and

County of San Francisco.

Why? One can only guess that transient Goldberg, who lives in Marin, and votes in San Francisco gets more than the special consideration of being allowed to

vote. What? Possibly anything.
After all, it is not generally
known that his bureau is operated, not by taxes collected from property owners, but rather by money paid to his bureau to purchase permits... from landlords. Would you "fine or imprison" landlords who were paying for the operation of your

bureau? This is not to say that anybody is acting illegal, but, why are good tenants evicted without cause, and why is rent gouging legal in California . . . but slum-lords can get away with almost anything? Including tearing down low income housing? Slumlords get rich at the expense of rent paying consumers.

Let's evict Goldberg and his kind. San Francisco, he says isn't good for his health. He's not good for tenants' health, either! Tenant Inquiry: APT

R. David Herndon, President

# Plan to Restrict SF Demolition

By TIMOTHY J. SMITH

An ad hoc coalition of neighborhood associations and special interest groups in San Francisco are engaged in an effort to win approval of a proposed Housing Demolition Ordinance designed after the Berkeley Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance. Unlike the Berkeley ordinance, however, the San Francisco legislation will permanently amend the city's building codes.

The ordinance would prohibit demolition of privately-owned houses until re-

**Analysis** 

placement housing for residents has been located. If this ordinance becomes law, it will be the first legislation of its kind in any major U.S. city.

The San Francisco Housing Demolition Ordinance will assure persons who are threatened with displacement by demolition that adequate, safe and affordable housing will be available to them before their present homes are destroyed. Those primarily affected by housing demolition are low-income tenants, often the elderly and minority women and men.

Already Bound

Federal and state agencies are already bound by legislation to provide assistance to displaced persons. This assistance includes moving expenses, a guarantee of adequate replacement housing at affordable rents, rent subsidies and required construction of replacement housing if the local vacancy rate if low.

The origins of the present legislation are traceable to an ad hoc committee which formed in 1969 in response to conflicts between developers and tenants in San Francisco. The debate over the Yerba Buena Center is perhaps the most highly publicized conflict. An early version of the Housing Demolition Ordinance was drafted in 1969 and later revised when Berkeley voters passed their initiative two years ago.

Unlike the Berkeley legislation, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and not the residents will vote on the Housing De-

molition Ordinance. On the eve of last week's citywide elections, proponents of the ordinance had anticipated its approval by the Board of Supervisors. Instead, the measure was referred to committee for the third time in what Supervisor Ronald Pelosi described as "treating the issue like a ping-pong ball" at a public hearing the week before.

Two Other Votes

On two previous occasions the Committee on Housing, Planning and Development has sent the ordinance to the full Board with a 2-1 recommendation for approval. Committee members Dorothy von Beroldingen and Robert Mendelsohn have supported the ordinance and chairman Ronald Pelosi has voted against it.

Enforcement of the ordinance will fall under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Building Inspection. At the last committee hearing, Bureau Superintendent Alfred Goldberg opposed the legislation on the grounds that it would require the printing of six additional forms which would cost the city between \$600 and \$700. Goldberg said, "Whether we like it or not, this city needs demolition."

Supervisor John Molinari, who introduced an earlier draft of the legislation last March, moved last week to postpone the full board's vote on it until further consideration by the committee. The move appeared to surprise many of the ordinance's supporters who met in the hallway of City Hall to discuss their future strategy.

Postpone

"Molinari's strategy," said Charles Smith of the International Hotel Tenants Association," is to postpone approval of the ordinance until a new mayor takes office in January. We think we have enough votes for approval, but we don't have eight votes to override a veto by Alioto, and we think he will veto it."

The run-off election for San Francisco mayor slated for Dec. 11 has important implications for the future of the Housing Demolition Ordinance. Whereas George Moscone has already pledged his support for the legislation, mayoral hopeful John Barbagelata opposes the initiative.

Supporters of the ordinance oppose the

continuing trend of "Manhattanization" of San Francisco at the expense of the city's residents. One supporter said, "People's right to decent housing is more important than developers' rights for profits."

'Manhattanization'

Opponents of the ordinance use the same "Manhattanization" argument to defeat the legislation. At the last public hearing one realtor said, "When private persons can no longer expect to develop their property, they will begin to abandon their buildings as they have done in New York. Then we will see the 'Manhattanization' of San Francisco." The opponents are fearful that placing private property owners under the restrictions of the Housing Demolition Ordinance will deter investment within San Francisco.

The initiative's supporters are concerned with the immediate future of the International Hotel on Kearny St. where 85 to 100 residents are faced with eviction. The property's corporate owners have requested permission to demolish the hotel, presumably to construct highrise offices.

Many of the hotel's residents are elderly Filipino men living on fixed incomes and paying from \$45 to \$50 per month for their rooms. The work and upkeep of the hotel are shared communally. The tenants are afraid that if the hotel is demolished, they will be unable to find housing that they can afford and still live communally.

Attempt to Evict

The owners of the International Hotel have attempted to evict the residents since 1969. In that year, a fire severely damaged the premises which the owners refused to repair. Berkeley students were among the volunteers who helped the tenants repair the damage and bring the hotel up to the city's safety regulations.

Members of the tenants association feel that the Housing Demolition Ordinance will be able to protect people throughout the city who are similarly threatened with eviction. According to International Hotel organizer Charles Smith, "What it comes down to is a battle between people in their homes and people who own property for money. We don't argue with their right to own property unless they attempt to hurt



Photo by Dick Wheeler

A proposed San Francisco ordinance will prohibit the demolition of privately owned housing until replacement housing is found.

us. They can't put us in the street just to build a building to make some money."

In April 1973, Berkeley voters approved the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance to protect the housing market for lower-income families. This initiative will be superseded by the city's revised Master Plan when approved early next year.

Until the revised Master Plan for Berkeley is completed, residents are using the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance to control demolition of existing structures in their neighborhoods. The ordinance stipulates that residents have adequate time to protest any proposed demolition in their neighborhoods. In addition, the ordinance requires that 25 per cent of all new units in multi-family housing must be for lower-income families.

. The Berkeley citizens have already affirmed their conviction that tenants deserve at least minimal protection in the event of demolition. Now it is up to the supervisors across the Bay to decide if San Francisco will guarantee the same to its residents.

## d, being l white



wn incomes, knowing that wage increase soon causes to rise and eventually out any gain we might have

Ve have little faith left in our nation political parties. They

### Landlords aren't forever

Should your landlord be obliged to find you another place to live before he can tear down his building?

That is certainly a tempting proposition in a town with a housing shortage, so tempting that an ordinance has been proposed and approved by a supervisor's committee to hang that responsibility on owners of buildings with three or more residential tenants.

But tempting though it is, the proposal makes more sense as a symptom of an illness rather than the cure.

The illness is the housing shortage.

The cure is more housing.

The ordinance wouldn't produce more housing. It almost certainly would produce less.

It would require the landlord wanting to tear down the old and build something new to find his tenants alternate housing (1) within their income and (2) comparable in terms of social factors.

That last requirement alone would open the barn door for infinite delaying tactics by any tenant who didn't want to move. With the help of his friendly Neighborhood Legal Assistance, he could keep the landlord tied up in court for years.

How might the landlord retaliate? For one thing, he might jack up the rent so high that the tenant damn well did move. There is nothing in the law to stop him from tearing down an empty building.

Or he might go the other direction. Since the ordinance doesn't apply to condemned buildings, he could let the place deteriorate to the point that the health inspector tacked a demolition notice on the door

Neither prospect is calculated to provide what tenants really need — a reasonable selection of housing to choose from.

The traditional pattern for urban housing has been a hand-me-down arrangement. Poor folks move in when the well-to-do move on to something better.

That isn't an ideal system, and there have been many attempts to improve upon it, without noteworthy success. Would anyone seriously argue that the low-rent housing projects have produced better results?

Advocates of the ordinance point out that Redevelopment is now required to find homes for victims of bulldozer eviction. So why shouldn't private property owners?

As one who screamed for years about Redevelopment's dereliction, I'm obliged to say there's a difference. Unlike the private owner, Redevelopment has the power of eminent domain and scads of federal money.

Even so, it does its duty tardily, grudgingly and not very well, for the most part moving people from one-run down hotel to another. Could the private landlord, with fewer resources, be expected to do any better?

Behind the pressure for the ordinance is bitterness over land grabs by St. Mary's and UC Hospitals. But the best defense against such power plays is a strong zoning code and politicians with enough backbone not to buckle under pressure.

(The supervisors who buckled under pressure from St. Mary's are now buckling under pressure from the tenants' lobby. What reason is there to think they won't buckle again when some well-wired landlord comes down on them?)

As a city with a falling population, San Francisco shouldn't have a housing shortage. The fact that one exists indicates a long history of faulty City Hall policies toward real estate.

Through sensible zoning, taxing and code enforcement, Ctty Hall could make San Francisco the attractive place for housing construction that it once was.

But an ordinance forcing landlords into the relocation business is an express ticket to stagnation.

#### Phyllis Battelle

# Some new rules for Santa Claus

The largest supplier of trained, bonded Santa Clauses in the world has established new rules for St. Nicksian behavior.

These include:

• Thous shalt not speak in a loud, hearty voice; nor use the child-frightening phrase "ho-ho."

putting on a show for an audience, or at least he shouldn't be," says Mike Diamond gently, "He is there to offer a happy memory and comfort to a child — a child who may be scared to death to be on his lap, but is there because he has been prodded by one or both parents. Actually," Mike adds, "the parents are the ones sitting

toward children than actors, but it isn't always possible.

"There are three phases in the meeting between Santa and a child. In the first phase, fright takes over the child and can have a lasting negative affect if it isn't handled sensitively. I tell the trainees never to use loud voices "Children don't know the difference. People don't achieve the ability to be bigoted till they're in their teens. But employers, of course, cater to the nature of their parents." A few organizations have hired women Clauses—but the females lower their voices, in such cases, and pretend to be male.

And "Santa no longer has to be big, or especially heavy, or even padded to look heavy. A man